

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

VADIM GOR, on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

UNIVERSAL FIDELITY LP

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
AND
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff VADIM GOR (hereinafter, “Plaintiff”), a New York resident, brings this class action complaint by and through his attorneys, Cohen & Mizrahi LLP, against Defendant UNIVERSAL FIDELITY LP (hereinafter “Defendant”), individually and on behalf of a class of all others similarly situated, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, based upon information and belief of Plaintiff’s counsel, except for allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiff, which are based upon Plaintiff’s personal knowledge.

INTRODUCTION/PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Congress enacted the FDCPA in 1977 in response to the “abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a). At that time, Congress was concerned that “abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to material instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy.” *Id.* Congress concluded that “existing laws . . . [we]re inadequate to protect consumers,” and that “the effective collection of debts” does not require “misrepresentation or other abusive debt collection practices.” 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692(b) & (c).
2. Congress explained that the purpose of the Act was not only to eliminate abusive debt collection practices, but also to “insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using

abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged.” *Id.* § 1692(e). After determining that the existing consumer protection laws were inadequate, *id.* § 1692(b), Congress gave consumers a private cause of action against debt collectors who fail to comply with the Act. *Id.* § 1692k.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this class action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.* and 28 U.S.C. § 2201. If applicable, the Court also has pendent jurisdiction over the state law claims in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
4. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

NATURE OF THE ACTION

5. Plaintiff brings this class action on behalf of a class of New York consumers seeking redress for Defendant’s actions of using an unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.
6. Defendant's actions violated § 1692 *et seq.* of Title 15 of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act (“FDCPA”) which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive and unfair practices.
7. Plaintiff is seeking damages, and declaratory and injunctive relief.

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff is a natural person and a resident of the State of New York, and is a “Consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692(a)(3).
9. Upon information and belief, Defendant's principal place of business is located in Houston, Texas.
10. Defendant is a company that uses the mail, telephone, and facsimile and regularly engages in business the principal purpose of which is to attempt to collect debts alleged to be due another.
11. Defendant is a “debt collector,” as defined under the FDCPA under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings claims, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (hereinafter “FRCP”)

Rule 23, individually and on behalf of the following consumer class (the “Class”):

- Plaintiff brings this action individually and as a class action on behalf of all persons similarly situated in the State of New York from whom Defendant attempted to collect a consumer debt using the same unlawful form letter herein, from one year before the date of this Complaint to the present.
- The Class period begins one year to the filing of this Action.

13. The Class satisfies all the requirements of Rule 23 of the FRCP for maintaining a class action:

- Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable because there are hundreds and/or thousands of persons who have received debt collection letters and/or notices from Defendant that violate specific provisions of the FDCPA. Plaintiff is complaining of a standard form letter and/or notice that is sent to hundreds of persons (*See Exhibit A*, except that the undersigned attorney has, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2 partially redacted the financial account numbers in an effort to protect Plaintiff’s privacy);
- There are questions of law and fact which are common to the Class and which predominate over questions affecting any individual Class member. These common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:
 - a. Whether Defendant violated various provisions of the FDCPA;
 - b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have been injured by Defendant’s conduct;
 - c. Whether Plaintiff and the Class have sustained damages and are

entitled to restitution as a result of Defendant's wrongdoing and if so, what is the proper measure and appropriate statutory formula to be applied in determining such damages and restitution; and

d. Whether Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to declaratory and/or injunctive relief.

- Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class, which all arise from the same operative facts and are based on the same legal theories.
- Plaintiff has no interest adverse or antagonistic to the interest of the other members of the Class.
- Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of the Class and has retained experienced and competent attorneys to represent the Class.
- A Class Action is superior to other methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims herein asserted. Plaintiff anticipates that no unusual difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class action.
- A Class Action will permit large numbers of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously and without the duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would engender. Class treatment will also permit the adjudication of relatively small claims by many Class members who could not otherwise afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein. Absent a Class Action, class members will continue to suffer losses of statutory protected rights as well as monetary damages. If Defendant's conduct is allowed to proceed without remedy they will continue to reap and retain the proceeds of their ill-gotten gains.

- Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the entire Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

ALLEGATIONS PARTICULAR TO VADIM GOR

14. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered “1” through “13” herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.
15. Defendant collects and attempts to collect debts incurred or alleged to have been incurred for personal, family or household purposes on behalf of creditors using the United States Postal Services, telephone and Internet.
16. Upon information and belief, within the last year Defendant commenced efforts to collect an alleged consumer “debt” as defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(5), when it mailed a Collection Letter to Plaintiff seeking to collect on an unpaid account allegedly owed to Bradford Authenticated.
17. On or around January 3, 2018, Defendant sent Plaintiff a collection letter (hereinafter, the “Letter”). *See Exhibit A.*
18. The Letter was sent or caused to be sent by persons employed by Defendant as a “debt collector” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6).
19. The Letter is a “communication” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(2).
20. The Letter was an initial communication between Plaintiff and Defendant.
21. The Letter states in pertinent part: “**RE:** Bradford Authenticated.”
22. As a result of the following Counts Defendant violated the FDCPA.

First Count

Violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692g, 1692e

Name of the Creditor to Whom the Debt is Owed

23. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates and incorporates the allegations contained in paragraphs numbered “1” through “22” herein with the same force and effect as if the same were set forth at length herein.

24. 15 U.S.C. § 1692g provides that within five days after the initial communication with a consumer in connection with the collection of any debt, a debt collector shall, unless the information is contained in the initial communication or the consumer has paid the debt, send the consumer a written notice containing certain enumerated information.
25. One such request is that the debt collector provide “the name of the creditor to whom the debt is owed.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2).
26. A debt collector has the obligation not just to convey the name of the creditor to whom the debt is owed, but also to convey such clearly.
27. A debt collector has the obligation not just to convey the name of the creditor to whom the debt is owed, but also to state such explicitly.
28. Merely naming the creditor without specifically identifying the entity as the current creditor to whom the debt is owed is not sufficient to comply with 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2).
29. Even if a debt collector conveys the required information, the debt collector nonetheless violates the FDCPA if it conveys that information in a confusing or contradictory fashion so as to cloud the required message with uncertainty.
30. When determining whether the name of the creditor to whom the debt is owed has been conveyed clearly, an objective standard, measured by how the “least sophisticated consumer” would interpret the notice, is applied.
31. Defendant's letter fails to explicitly identify the name of the creditor to whom the debt is owed.
32. Defendant's January 3, 2018 letter to Plaintiff fails to identify any creditor to whom the debt is owed.
33. Indeed, Defendant's letter fails to identify any entity or individual as a “creditor.”
34. Defendant's letter merely states, “**RE:** Bradford Authenticated.”

35. The Letter fails to indicate whether the “Re:” refers to Plaintiff’s creditor.
36. The Letter fails to indicate whether the “Re:” refers to the creditor to whom the debt is owed.
37. The Letter fails to indicate whether the “Re:” refers to the original creditor or the current creditor to whom the debt is owed.
38. Defendant’s Letter merely states, “The debt that you owe to the above-referenced client has been placed with Universal Fidelity LP.”
39. The Letter fails to indicate who the “above-referenced client” is, as there was no reference to any “client” in any portion of the Letter.
40. The Letter fails to indicate who referred the account to Defendant.
41. Defendant failed to clearly state the name of the creditor to whom the debt is owed.
42. The least sophisticated consumer would likely be confused as to the creditor to whom the debt is owed.
43. Defendant has violated § 1692g as it failed to clearly and explicitly convey the name of the creditor to whom the debt is owed.
44. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e prohibits a debt collector from using any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.
45. While § 1692e specifically prohibits certain practices, the list is non-exhaustive, and does not preclude a claim of falsity or deception based on any non-enumerated practice.
46. Collection notices are deceptive if they can be reasonably read to have two or more different meanings, one of which is inaccurate.
47. The question of whether a collection letter is deceptive is determined from the perspective of the “least sophisticated consumer.”

48. For purposes of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e, the failure to clearly and accurately identify the creditor to whom the debt is owed is unfair and deceptive to the least sophisticated consumer.
49. Defendant violated § 1692e by using a false, deceptive and misleading representation in its attempt to collect a debt. *Datiz v. Int'l Recovery Assocs., Inc.*, No. 15CV3549ADSAKT, 2016 WL 4148330 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 4, 2016), motion for relief from judgment denied, No. 15CV3549ADSAKT, 2017 WL 59085 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 4, 2017); *McGinty v. Prof'l Claims Bureau, Inc.*, No. 15CV4356SJFARL, 2016 WL 6069180 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 17, 2016).
50. Defendant could have taken the steps necessary to bring its actions within compliance with the FDCPA but neglected to do so and failed to adequately review its actions to ensure compliance with the law.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants as follows:

- (a) Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a Class Action and certifying Plaintiff as Class representative and Cohen & Mizrahi LLP, as Class Counsel;
- (b) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class statutory damages;
- (c) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class actual damages;
- (d) Awarding Plaintiff costs of this Action, including reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses;
- (e) Awarding pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest; and
- (f) Awarding Plaintiff and the Class such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Daniel Cohen
Daniel Cohen, Esq.
Cohen & Mizrahi LLP
300 Cadman Plaza West. 12th Floor
Brooklyn, New York 11201
Phone: (929) 575-4175
Fax: (929) 575-4195
Email: Dan@cml.legal
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

/s/ Daniel Cohen
Daniel Cohen, Esq.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
March 9, 2018